




UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

17



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/751,130

12/31/2003

Se Kit Yuen

AGUP030234-JML

1738

7590
Dr. Arthur King Ma
1030 Coronado Drive
Arcadia, CA 91007

05/06/2008

EXAMINER

MAYEKAR, KISHOR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/751,130

Applicant(s)

YUEN, SE KIT

Examiner

Kishor Mayekar

Art Unit

1753

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site <http://www.uspto.gov> in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "18" and "19" each has been used to designate both air collector and air collector wall. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any

Art Unit: 1753

amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the recited air aggregator, high negative voltage discharge/carbonated fiber, anion generating circuit and UV radiation tube generating 253.7nm start up circuit must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to

Art Unit: 1753

the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "SARS virus" in page 1 without an explanation, the use of the term "said" in page 2, and the grammatical incorrect in the full second and third paragraphs of page 6.

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

Art Unit: 1753

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the antecedent basis for the recitation "an air aggregator".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-11 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

9. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is indefinite for not using the correct clause "means" to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. Also, the word "means" is

Art Unit: 1753

preceded by the word(s) "two extractor fan mean" in an attempt to use a "mean[s]" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967). The recitation "sharp" is confusing as to its meanings. The recitation "for mean for drawing air" is also confusing to its equivalent structure. The recitation "an ultraviolet radiation tube mean" is confusing as to its correlation with the identical recitation in the claim. The recitation "the quantity of anions is integrally" is confusing and lacking antecedent basis. The recitation "said air inlet ... are connected at both ends of said a ... tube mean" is confusing. The recitation "said ultraviolet radiation tube" lacks antecedent basis. The recitations "said body", "said extractor fan", "said air exhaust frame trellis device", and "said polarization end ultraviolet ray radiation tube" lack antecedent basis. The recited "an air intake frame trellis device provides" is confusing as to its correlation with the identical recitation in the claim.

Claim 2 is indefinite because it recites "at least two extractor fan" without any correlation to the identical recitation in claim 1. The recitations "said square-columnar body" and either "the polarization end ultraviolet ray radiation tube" or "said polarization end ultraviolet ray radiation tube" lack antecedent basis.

In claim 3, the recitations "the side" and "said body" lack antecedent basis.

Art Unit: 1753

In claim 4, the recitation "said body" lacks antecedent basis and the recitation "LBD" is indefinite for its meaning.

In claim 5, the recitation "said body" lacks antecedent basis and the recitation "said body is in square-columnar structure" is confusing. The recited "at least one extractor fan, transformer, at least a polarization end UV ray radiation tube, and at least one cathodal ... wire" is confusing as to its correlation with the identical recitation in the claim.

In claim 6, the recitation "said polarization end ultraviolet ray radiation tube" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 7, the same is applied to claim 6.

In claim 8, the recitation "said body", "the power line", "the vehicular power supply" and "the municipal power" lack antecedent basis.

In claim 9, the same is applied to claim 8.

In claim 10, the recitations "said body", "said electric motor" and "said extractor fan" lacks antecedent basis and the recitation "LBD" is indefinite for its meaning.

In claim 11, the phrase "the said body" is incorrect. The recitation "is equipped with one air inlet" is confusing with the recitations "the air inlet locates at the front ..." and "the air inlet locates at the rear ...". The recitation "device provides an air inlet" is confusing with the recitation "said body ... with one air inlet". The recitation "the inner surface" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinaiko et al. (US 2002/0122751 A1). Sinaiko's invention is directed to air purifier, comprising a three-dimensional housing with a plurality of air inlets and outlets (Figs. 2 and 3); wherein the housing comprises the recited fan means for drawing air into the housing through the air inlet (paragraph 207), through the recited UV tube means and out of the housing through the air outlet (paragraphs 149-152), the recited air aggregator provided between the fan means and the housing (character 242 shown in Fig. 3B), the recited electric circuit with a voltage transformer (character 116) connected with an indicator light (character 180 in paragraph 141), the recited starter, switch and plug (Figs. 4A-4C and paragraphs 163-169), the recited high negative voltage discharge/carbonated fiber (character 232), the recited anion generating circuit (paragraphs 173 and 174), the recited start up circuit (paragraphs 149-152), the recited air intake frame trellis device (character 212), and the recited air collector (character 274a and 274b). Sinaiko also

Art Unit: 1753

discloses in Figs 1 and 2 an airflow arrangement of a prior art. The differences between Sinaiko and the above claims are the intended use of the air purifier as a vehicular photoelectron air purifier and the housing being square columnar. As to the former, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the reference's teachings because it has been held on the intended use of a device that "apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does", *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 15 USPQ 2d 1525. As to the latter, change in shape has been held to be obvious, *In re Dailey* 149 USPQ 47.

As to the subject matter of each of claims 3-5 and 8-10, Sinaiko discloses it in Figs. 3 and 4.

Double Patenting

12. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be

commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

13. Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-12 of copending Application No. 10/792,075. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations in the above claims are met with respect to claims 1 and 3-12 of the copending applications..

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.


Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Kishor Mayekar
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1753

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 10/751,130	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination YUEN, SE KIT	
	Examiner Kishor Mayekar	Art Unit 1753	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-2002/0122751 A1	09-2002	Sinaiko et al.	422/186
	B	US-			
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS


*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

Organization: U.S. Bldg/Room
United States Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
If Undeliverable Return in Ten Days




02 1M \$01.31⁰
0004244975 MAY 06 1:008
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

RECEIVED
NOV 18 2008
UNABLE TO FORWARD
UNDELIVERABLE
NOV 18 2008

RECEIVED
JUN 18 2008
USPTO MAIL CENTER



Handwritten signature or initials.